

American Opinion Summary

Department of State

Permanent file copy
Do not remove.

No. 13:

January 10, 1963

A- Representative Summary of Public Opinion
C- IDIA.

1. RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES: INTERNATIONAL

The editorially stated that Mr. Dean's personal conduct in leaving without notice was "a serious blow to the negotiator of peace." His departure "immediately threw the feeling that he had become discouraged with the slow pace of the proceedings," the St. Louis Post-Dispatch comments. "And Mr. Dean is a man who is not easily discouraged."

The St. Louis Post also in the paragraph of the editorial persistent "shows clear indication that there is no belief in the great possibility of a compromise peace which is well put into that thought that would result of hope that we have been able to nourish."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch also in the paragraph of the editorial remarks that "the feeling exists that there is little room in continuing the talks until the Russians change their policy," the New York Times states. "George Howard's Washington Post says that if we are to go on with the chance of trying to negotiate with the Communists, it is not bad" Mr. Dean "couldn't see his way to staying."

The St. Louis Post concludes that "the Russians have obviously determined that a nuclear war will be in their interests now or in the foreseeable future," and suggests that "U.S. diplomatic missions and information agents should make this fact perfectly clear to all the peoples of the world."

There "is an enormous consensus in this country that there must be a new approach," according to the Washington Post. The Post interprets this as "a kind of tribute to Arthur H. Dean," because if he "could not make any progress in his postcard and putting effort, there is not much likelihood that anyone else can." The Post goes on to suggest: "If we cannot have disarmament, perhaps we could make some progress toward that method and toward methods of minimizing the possibilities of nuclear testing and accident."

2. CUBA

Initial reaction to the Joint U.S.-Russian request to the UN for termination of their Cuban disarmament focuses on the "issue" expressed that actions taken to avoid war over Cuba will ease tensions in other areas.

Public Opinion Studies Staff • Bureau of Public Affairs

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OWNA
(Contd.):

The Washington Star feels the U.S.-Cuban record "is not unimpressive." The assumption is that similar steps will be identified from Cuba in the period immediately ahead, cover the flag, and despite failure to get on-site verification of weapons removal, Washington will maintain constant surveillance of Cuba, and Moscow "apparently is quite amenable" to this. The Star concludes that "on the whole, America seems to have come out of the crisis quite well."

But in view of the points of dispute that continue unresolved, adds the Philadelphia Inquirer, "it should be clear to Khrushchev and Castro that the U.S. is compelled to reserve the right to take whatever action may be required in the future--including, possibly, the invasion of Cuba--to counter any further offensive threat."

The Chicago Tribune, meanwhile, claims that the Americans "have demonstrated some capability for the execution of 'some' military action that the Russians did not expect." Adds on Cuba in which the parties "got nowhere on the terms in controversy." David Lawrence sees Russia left with "a decisive victory, and the U.S. with a defeat and a reversal" of the Monroe Doctrine.

The prospects of a "tenuously a and Cuba" continues in Michigan in the "New York Herald Tribune" which says that the "tenuously" situation of what was might be "edge" of the Soviet record in Cuba came in for "prominent and exclusive discussion" between the President and Russian minister Kuznetsov yesterday.

With others, Time warns that while the Russians have removed missiles and bombers, "they are apparently still pumping 'defense' arms" into Cuba (e.g., Mergueise Higgins, New York). With "company of undisciplined power hidden in Cuba," John S. Knight, adds: "Having been fooled once, could it not happen again?" The Chicago Sun-Times complains of "a relationship" lately of Washington's "get tough attitude" toward Castro.